

## OPINION 1285

*BARBUS ALTIANALIS* BOULENGER, 1900 AND *B. RUEPELLI* BOULENGER, 1902 (PISCES, CYPRINIDAE): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers the specific name *rueppellii* Pfeffer, 1896, as published in the binomen *Labeo rueppellii*, and all uses of that name prior to the publication of *Barbus rueppellii* by Boulenger, 1902, are hereby suppressed for the purposes of both the Law of Priority and the Law of Homonymy.

(2) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

- (a) *altianalis* Boulenger, 1900, as published in the binomen *Barbus altianalis* (Name Number 2911);
- (b) *rueppelli* Boulenger, 1902, as published in the binomen *Barbus rueppelli* (Name Number 2912).

(3) The specific name *rueppellii* Pfeffer, 1896, as published in the binomen *Labeo rueppellii*, and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1135.

## HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2164

An application for the conservation of *Barbus altianalis* Boulenger, 1900 and *B. rueppelli* Boulenger, 1902 was first received from Dr Gordon McG. Reid on 2 February 1976. It was sent to the printer on 1 August 1979 and printed on 18 February 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, pp. 249–251. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials and to seven general and three ichthyological serials. No comment was received.

## DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 12 March 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule in Voting Paper (84)10 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, p. 250. At the close of the voting period on 12 June 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-one (21) received in the following order: Melville, Savage, Cocks, Willink, Schuster, Halvorsen, Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Holthuis, Brinck, Mroczkowski, Binder, Corliss, Alvarado, Bayer, Uéno, Cogger, Kraus, Ride, Heppell, Lehtinen

Negative Votes — two (2): Hahn, Dupuis.

No voting papers were returned by Bernardi and Sabrosky.

The following comments were sent in by members of the

Commission with their voting papers:

*Hahn*: 'I vote against because the problem is not presented clearly enough. On p. 249 it is said that there is no doubt that the holotypes of *L. rueppellii* and *B. altianalis* are conspecific, but on p. 250 it is shown that they belong to different subspecies: *rueppellii rueppellii* = *altianalis radcliffii* and *altianalis altianalis* = *rueppellii altianalis*. It cannot be excluded that some author will treat them as different species and therefore the relative precedence procedure would have been preferable. Moreover, it is not clearly stated why *Barbus rueppelli* Boulanger, 1902 should be conserved.'

*Dupuis*: 'De l'avis du requérant "the name *Barbus rueppelli* Boulenger is of uncertain status in the present state of knowledge of this group". Ceci illustre les difficultés bien connues de l'étude populationnelle et biogéographique des poissons des lacs africains. Il me paraît donc assez contradictoire, ou en tout cas prématuré, de vouloir trancher en termes de nomenclature un problème taxinomique qui peut réserver des surprises.'

#### ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion: *altianalis*, *Barbus*, Boulenger, 1900, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (7) vol. 6, p. 159  
*rueppelli*, *Barbus*, Boulenger, 1902, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (7) vol. 10, pp. 423, 427, 428  
*rueppellii*, *Labeo*, Pfeffer, 1896, Die Fische Ost-Afrikas in *Die Thierwelt Deutsch-ost-Afrikas u.d. Nachbargebiete* (3), pp. 51–52.

#### CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes on V.P. (84)10 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1285.

R. V. MELVILLE

Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

London

5 July 1984